



Nurturing Children, Supporting Communities, Strengthening Families

CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND BOARD MEETING Tuesday, April 14, 2015

2401 Colonial Drive, Helena, MT 59601
Large Conference Room, 3rd Floor

Our purpose

The Children's Trust Fund exists to change outcomes in all children ages zero to 18 to ensure the protective factors are in place.

Our Vision

Our Montana children, ages birth to 18 years:

- ~ Are born into and raised in safe, stable, nurturing environments; and
- ~ Have parents who have confidence in their parenting skills, and who know where to go for help.

Our Montana communities:

- ~ Provide the training for parenting skills that people need and want;
- ~ Have resource directories in place so families can access and apply for services in streamlined ways;
- ~ Acknowledge the best practice parenting approaches and specifically know about and value the protective factors;
- ~ Consider raising children a priority community and collective responsibility; and
- ~ Learn from each other about the most effective approaches for parenting.

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 8:00 | Introductions, mission & vision, agenda - <i>JoAnn</i> |
| 8:05 | Fiscal Report/Budget – <i>Mae/Jamey</i> |
| 8:10-10:55 | RFP Proposal Evaluations- <i>guided by State Procurement Officers Justin Harris and Jen Garza</i> |
| 11:00-11:45 | CAN Conference Award Ceremony-Present 4 Awards <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Strengthening Families Award to Sylvia Danforth, DEAP and Echo Jamieson, Forever Families➤ Pinwheels for Prevention Award to Mary Gallagher (husband and sisters to accept on her behalf)➤ Outstanding Corporate Citizenship Award to BCBS |
| 11:45-12:30 | Luncheon at CAN Conference |
| 12:35-5:30 | Finish Proposal Evaluations |
| 5:30 | Public Comment & Adjourn |
| 5:00-6:30 | PURPLE Meet & Greet Reception at CAN Conference |

<http://www.mapquest.com/maps?address=2401%20Colonial%20Dr&city=Helena&state=MT&zipcode=59601>

The Children's Trust Fund makes reasonable accommodations for any known disability that may interfere with a person's ability to participate in public meetings. Persons needing an accommodation must notify CTF no later than three days before the meeting date to allow enough time to make arrangements. To make your request, you can call (406) 444-3002 or through the Montana Relay 711.



Nurturing Children, Supporting Communities, Strengthening Families



April 14, 2015 Sign-In

John Felt
Jamey EA
Casey Malloy
Jo Ann Eder

Patty Butler

Kristina Davis

Clementine Lindley

Ann Gilkey

Jennifer Garza

Justin Harris

P.O. Box 4210 • Helena, MT 59604-4210
www.dphhs.mt.gov/childrenstrustfund

CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND BOARD MEETING MINUTES

1. Who will give CAN Conference Awards?
 - a. Casey suggested Clementine and Jo Ann with board members in the picture
 - i. Patty agrees
 - ii. Jo Ann can't talk on the fly
 - iii. Clementine wants something written
 - b. Jamey should give BCBS award because she got the grant
2. Fiscal Report
 - a. National Meeting, board travel (budgeted \$18,500)
 - i. Ann: If Melissa goes, do we have enough funds?
 1. Jamey: Pretty sure, but will check with fiscal
 - b. Part time position up to 30 hours
 - i. Budget for 60 hours
 - c. Kristina: Can we travel to grantees' sites?
 - i. Yes.



Nurturing Children, Supporting Communities, Strengthening Families

- ii. For the funded proposals looking to hire someone, we should sit in on interviews.
 - iii. We should attend coalition meetings.
- 3. Funding Proposals
 - a. Jo Ann:
 - i. Very excited, very different/interesting proposals.
 - ii. 3 out of 9 reservations!
 - iii. Concerned about the “Haves and Have Nots”
 - 1. Some that needed resources
 - 2. Some that just needed to inform about their resources
 - iv. Some proposals were written better than others
 - b. Clementine:
 - i. Hoping that Patty knows a lot about them.
 - ii. Need and location is really important.
 - c. Patty:
 - i. Has some knowledge, knowledge on some more than others.
 - ii. Follow the rules, not up to us to fill in the blanks even if we know there is a need.
 - iii. A few questions have been raised about this RFP. Learned who to run it by. The reason is that we are making this community work.
 - d. Kristina:
 - i. United Way writers vs. Grassroots writers
 - 1. Isn't United Way supposed to be giving funds to the community? Are they are asking us for funds to give??
 - a. Clementine: Thinks they aren't the only ones writing the grant, and they might be the fiscal agent.
 - e. Clementine:
 - i. Grassroots vs. Have Nots - still met requirements, very impressed!
 - f. Ann:
 - i. Will learn a lot today.
 - ii. Having a hard time with “Haves vs. Have Nots”
 - g. Introduce Justin Harris
 - h. Any Questions before we start?
 - i. Jo Ann: What is considered “Hard Cash”
 - 1. Cash that wouldn't have already been dedicated



Nurturing Children, Supporting Communities, Strengthening Families

- 2. Jamey: Depends on their narrative
 - 3. Clementine: as ED, plans for the funds in budget before actually receiving grants
 - i. Jo Ann: Eliminate MSU grant proposal from proposals
 - i. Kristina: Sad to see it go
 - ii. Jamey: Have to incorporate Best Beginnings
 - iii. Justin: Non responsive, so we don't need to score it.
 - 1. Can have a discussion with them after the procurement process.
 - j. Jennifer Garza: RFP process
 - i. Have to have consensus on score sheet. It becomes public.
 - ii. Have to go through each section.
 - iii. If you want people to come in and defend their proposal, you have to write a clarification process/interview into the RFP.
 - k. Patty wants to eliminate United Way of Lewis & Clark from proposals
 - i. No evidence-based (or evidence-informed) program noted in Section 3.6.1
 - ii. Fund coordinator would not make it a community effort
 - iii. Ann: Don't think it's black and white
 - iv. Jamey reads executive summary
 - v. ***Decision to score the proposal
 - l. 3.2.c. taken out for all
 - i. We need to be clear
 - m. 3.2.j. changed to contact info and address
 - i. How would we know?
 - n. If included, but have to look, it is not a "deficiency" just a lower "good"
 - o. Procurement checking page numbers
 - i. What counts towards page #?
 - p. Remove Overall Compliance from scoring criteria
 - q. Patty abstains from scoring on Gallatin proposal due to her work on another grant with this coalition but will be an informational witness.
4. Things to consider for next RFP
- a. 500 word limit, 12 pt font, # of pages --- unclear
 - i. Either needs to be checked or taken out
 - b. Fix section 3.2 (see above)
 - c. Have them list all evidence-based programs used by the coalition
 - d. Ask for proof of MOU when talking about community partners



Nurturing Children, Supporting Communities, Strengthening Families

- i. 5.1.2 should be 5.2.2
 - f. Remove overall compliance
 - i. Unless we're going to check everything
 - g. Logic Model
 - i. Say use template provided not just the format
 - h. Be Clear about what is required in the Table of Contents
 - i. State parent/consumer is an individual parent that is a consumer
 - i. Fix ambiguous language
 - ii. After looking back at RFP, the language is clear
 - j. Fix # ranges on score sheet
 - k. Clarify Evidence-based programs
 - i. Goal states "child abuse and neglect evidence-based program"
 - ii. What's acceptable? SAMSHA programs?
 - l. Combine organization and staffing sections
 - m. Whose mission & vision are we asking for?
 - i. The coalition or the fiscal agent?
 - n. Deduct points for not being ECCC
- 5. Revisit at next board meeting
 - a. Statewide messaging to be done by us instead of a grant
 - b. Talk about what we could do with data systems (from Gallatin proposal)